MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address

SOUTHWEST GENERAL HOSPITAL 7400 BARLITE BLVD SAN ANTONIO TX 78224-1308

Respondent Name

TEXAS MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY

MFDR Tracking Number

M4-05-6797-01

Carrier's Austin Representative Box

Box Number 54

MFDR Date Received

April 25, 2005

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary: "Claim should be paid at 75% of bill charges without any provision for carveout of implants."

out of implants.

Amount in Dispute: \$21,513.01

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary: "It is this carrier's position that a) the requester failed to produce any credible evidence that its billing for the disputed procedures is fair and reasonable; b) the requester failed to prove its usual and customary fees for the service in dispute is fair and reasonable are consistent with Section 413.011(b); c) this carrier's payment is consistent with fair and reasonable criteria established in Section 413.011(b) of the Texas Labor Code; and d) Medicare fair and reasonable reimbursement for similar or same services is below this carrier's."

Response Submitted by: Texas Mutual Insurance Company, 221 West 6th Street, Suite 300, Austin, Texas 78701

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Date(s) of Service	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
August 1, 2004 to August 31, 2004	Outpatient Hospital Services	\$21,513.01	\$0.00

FINDINGS AND DECISION

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

Background

- 1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307 sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
- 2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1 sets forth general provisions related to use of the fee guidelines.
- 3. Texas Labor Code §413.011 sets forth provisions regarding reimbursement policies and guidelines.
- 4. This request for medical fee dispute resolution was received by the Division on April 25, 2005. Pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3), effective January 1, 2003, 27 *Texas Register* 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, the Division notified the requestor on May 5, 2005 to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute as set forth in the rule.

- 5. The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:
 - M No MAR
 - RD THE REIMBURSEMENT FOR THE SERVICE RENDERED HAS BEEN DETERMINED TO BE FAIR AND REASONABLE BASED ON BILLING AND PAYMENT RESEARCH AND IS IN ACCORDANCE WITH LABOR CODE 413.011(B).
 - F Fee guideline MAR reduction
 - 420 SUPPLEMENTAL PAYMENT.
 - 891 THE INSURANCE COMPANY IS REDUCING OR DENYING PAYMENT AFTER RECONSIDERING A BILL.
 - 52 THE REFERRING/PRESCRIBING/RENDERING PROVIDER IS NOT ELIGIBLE TO REFER/PRESCRIBE/ORDER/PERFORM THE SERVICE BILLED.
 - 242 NOT TREATING DOCTOR.
 - 150 PAYMENT ADJUSTED BECAUSE THE PAYER DEEMS THE INFORMATION SUBMITTED DOES NOT SUPPORT THIS LEVEL OF SERVICE.
 - 426 REIMBURSED TO FAIR AND REASONABLE.

Findings

- 1. The insurance carrier denied disputed services with reason codes 52 "THE REFERRING/PRESCRIBING/ RENDERING PROVIDER IS NOT ELIGIBLE TO REFER/PRESCRIBE/ORDER/PERFORM THE SERVICE BILLED" and 242 – "NOT TREATING DOCTOR." Review of the submitted information finds no documentation or explanation to support these denial reasons. These services will therefore be considered for review per applicable division rules and fee guidelines.
- 2. This dispute relates to services with reimbursement subject to the provisions of former 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1(c), effective May 16, 2002, 27 Texas Register 4047, which requires that "Reimbursement for services not identified in an established fee guideline shall be reimbursed at fair and reasonable rates as described in the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, §413.011 until such period that specific fee guidelines are established by the commission."
- 3. Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) requires that fee guidelines must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual's behalf. It further requires that the Division consider the increased security of payment afforded by the Act in establishing the fee guidelines.
- 4. Former 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(e)(2)(C), effective January 1, 2003, 27 *Texas Register* 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires that the request shall include "a table listing the specific disputed health care and charges in the form, format and manner prescribed by the commission." Review of the submitted form DWC-60 *Table of Disputed Services* finds that the requestor has listed the disputed dates of service as September 1 to September 30, 2004. Review of the submitted medical bills, medical records and explanations of benefits finds that the disputed services were rendered from August 1 to August 31, 2004. The Division concludes that the requestor has failed to complete the required sections of the request in the form, format and manner prescribed under §133.307(e)(2)(C). However, the Division has determined that the dates listed on the requestor's table are the result of a typographical error. The Division will deem the disputed dates of service to be August 1 through August 31, 2004 for the purpose of this review.
- 5. Former 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iii), effective January 1, 2003, 27 *Texas Register* 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include "how the Texas Labor Code and commission rules, and fee guidelines, impact the disputed fee issues." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not discuss how the Texas Labor Code and Division rules impact the disputed fee issues. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iii).
- 6. Former 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iv), effective January 1, 2003, 27 Texas Register 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include "how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue." Review of the requestor's documentation finds that the requestor has not discussed how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iv).
- 7. Former 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3)(D), effective January 1, 2003, 27 Texas Register 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to provide "documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement." Review of the submitted documentation finds that:
 - The requestor's rationale for increased reimbursement from the *Table of Disputed Services* asserts that "Claim should be paid at 75% of bill charges without any provision for carve-out of implants."
 - The requestor did not submit documentation to support that the claim should be paid at 75% of bill charges

without any provision for carve-out of implants.

The Division has previously found that a reimbursement methodology based upon payment of a percentage
of a hospital's billed charges does not produce an acceptable payment amount. This methodology was
considered and rejected by the Division in the adoption preamble to the Division's former Acute Care
Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline, which states at 22 Texas Register 6276 that:

A discount from billed charges was another method of reimbursement which was considered. Again, this method was found unacceptable because it leaves the ultimate reimbursement in the control of the hospital, thus defeating the statutory objective of effective cost control and the statutory standard not to pay more than for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living. It also provides no incentive to contain medical costs, would be administratively burdensome for the Commission and system participants, and would require additional Commission resources.

Therefore, a reimbursement amount that is calculated based upon a percentage of a hospital's billed charges cannot be favorably considered when no other data or documentation was submitted to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in dispute.

- The requestor did not submit documentation to support that payment of the amount sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in this dispute.
- The requestor did not support that payment of the requested amount would satisfy the requirements of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1.

The request for additional reimbursement is not supported. Thorough review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor has not demonstrated or justified that payment of the amount sought would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute. Additional payment cannot be recommended.

Conclusion

The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution, and the thorough review and consideration of that evidence. After thorough review and consideration of all the evidence presented by the parties to this dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The Division concludes that this dispute was not filed in the form and manner prescribed under Division rules at 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307. The Division further concludes that the requestor failed to support its position that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

ORDER

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is entitled to \$0.00 reimbursement for the services in dispute.

Authorized Signature

	Grayson Richardson	July 16, 2013
Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	Date

YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute may appeal this decision by requesting a contested case hearing. A completed **Request for a Medical Contested Case Hearing** (form **DWC045A**) must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with the Division. **Please include a copy of the Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision** together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §148.3(c), including a **certificate of service demonstrating that the request has been sent to the other party**.

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.